

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 6

August 7, 2018

308 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Shirley P. v. Norman P., 329 C 648	2
<i>Marital dissolution; claim that property division award should be reversed when trial court's finding that defendant husband was solely responsible for marital breakdown rested exclusively on defendant's criminal conviction that subsequently was reversed on appeal; application of doctrine of collateral estoppel to judgments reversed on appeal, discussed.</i>	
Tannone v. Amica Mutual Ins. Co., 329 C 665	19
<i>Underinsured motorist benefits; whether trial court properly granted defendant's motions for summary judgment on ground that underinsured vehicle was owned by self-insured rental car company and excluded from coverage under plaintiffs' insurance policies; claim that coverage exclusion that was authorized by state insurance regulation (§ 38a-334-6 [c] [2] [B]) was invalid as applied following passage of federal legislation (49 U.S.C. § 30106 [a] [2012]) that provided immunity to rental car companies for claims of vicarious liability for injuries caused by negligence of their lessees; whether federal legislation resulted in impermissible contradiction between public policy behind underinsured motorist statute (§ 38a-336 [a] [1] [A]) and § 38a-334-6 (c) (2) (B) of regulations; whether rental car company was self-insurer as to risks created by negligence of its lessees when it was statutorily immune from liability for such risks; claim that legislative and administrative acquiescence despite opportunity and ability to respond to passage of federal legislation meant that there was no intent to disturb self-insurer exclusion authorized by § 38a-334-6 (c) (2) (B) of regulations.</i>	
Trinity Christian School v. Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities, 329 C 684 . .	38
<i>Alleged employment discrimination by plaintiff religious institution; motion to dismiss employment discrimination complaint; interlocutory administrative appeal from defendant commission's denial of plaintiff's motion to dismiss employment discrimination complaint; trial court's dismissal of plaintiff's appeal for lack of jurisdiction; claim that trial court improperly granted commission's motion to dismiss appeal because statute (§ 52-571b [d]) prohibiting state from burdening religious beliefs immunizes religious institutions from employment discrimination actions, and claim that plaintiff's appeal therefore was proper under immunity exception to general prohibition against interlocutory administrative appeals; whether trial court correctly concluded that § 52-571b (d) did not purport to confer on religious institutions immunity from employment discrimination actions; recognition of ministerial exception to employment discrimination laws in Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church & School v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (565 U.S. 171) as affirmative defense to otherwise cognizable employment discrimination claim rather than jurisdictional bar to such claim, discussed.</i>	
Volume 329 Cumulative Table of Cases	57

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Banks v. Commissioner of Correction, 184 CA 101	103A
<i>Habeas corpus; kidnapping in first degree; robbery in first degree; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; claim that habeas court improperly determined that lack of jury instruction pursuant to State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509) concerning intent and conduct necessary to find petitioner guilty of kidnapping was harmless</i>	

(continued on next page)

beyond reasonable doubt; whether significance of Salamon factors for making determination of whether petitioner's movement or confinement of individuals was necessary or incidental to commission of robberies that were in favor of petitioner outweighed significance of factors that supported claim of harmless error; whether respondent Commissioner of Correction met considerable burden to persuade court beyond reasonable doubt that absence of Salamon jury instruction did not contribute to jury verdict regarding kidnapping counts; whether question of petitioner's intent in movement and confinement of individuals was uncontested or supported by overwhelming evidence.

- Bell v. Commissioner of Correction, 184 CA 150 152A
Habeas corpus; kidnapping in first degree; robbery in first degree; claim that petitioner was entitled to jury instruction on kidnapping charges pursuant to State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509); whether lack of Salamon instruction was harmless error; whether properly instructed jury would not have concluded necessarily that robberies were completed prior to movement and confinement of victims; whether properly instructed jury could have determined that movement and confinement occurred during continuous sequence of events that was related to taking of money from safes and was not separate criminal offense; whether question of petitioner's intent in moving and confining victims during robberies was contested; whether movement and confinement of victims constituted continuous, uninterrupted course of conduct that was related to robberies or independent criminal acts that established petitioner's intent to prevent victims' liberation for longer period of time and to greater degree than was necessary for commission of robberies.
- Crismale v. Walston, 184 CA 2. 4A
Defamation; slander; malicious prosecution; claim that there were genuine issues of material fact as to whether qualified privilege, which protected named defendant's statements to enforcement officers that plaintiff was trespassing on clam beds and stealing clams, could be defeated because statements were made with malice; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment on slander claim, on basis of named defendant's statement to newspaper reporter, after concluding that statement was opinion on matter of public concern that was protected by fair comment privilege; whether statement to reporter was statement of fact rather than statement of opinion; whether uncontested facts established truth of statement that was absolute bar to slander claim; whether there was genuine issue of material fact as to whether named defendant provided misleading information to Department of Energy and Environmental Protection that induced enforcement officers to arrest plaintiff.
- Goodwin Estate Assn., Inc. v. Starke, 184 CA 92 94A
Foreclosure; whether trial court improperly denied motions to dismiss and to open judgment; reviewability of claim that trial court, in denying motion to dismiss, improperly considered equities and length of time that plaintiff had been deprived of fees; claim that trial court committed plain error in denying motion to dismiss because defendant had not received notice from plaintiff of adopted standard foreclosure policy.

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
 Office of Production and Distribution
 111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
 Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*

Published Weekly – Available at <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
 ERIC M. LEVINE, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions*
 Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

Green v. Commissioner of Correction, 184 CA 76.	78A
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed habeas petition pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 23-24) without holding hearing; whether habeas court properly dismissed habeas petition sua sponte for lack of jurisdiction; claim that petitioner was being deprived of risk reduction credits; whether petitioner had constitutionally protected liberty interest in risk reduction credits; whether applicable statute (§ 18-98e) conferred broad discretion on respondent Commissioner of Correction to award such credits; claim that commissioner altered discretionary nature of risk credit program by entering into binding contract with petitioner.</i>	
State v. Ezequiel R., 184 CA 55	57A
<i>Aggravated sexual assault of minor; sexual assault in first degree; risk of injury to child; sexual assault in fourth degree; whether trial court properly determined that victim's statements made during forensic interview fell within medical diagnosis or treatment exception to hearsay rule; whether trial court abused discretion in admitting video recording of victim's forensic interview into evidence; whether statements during forensic interview of child that are offered solely under medical diagnosis and treatment exception are admissible if such statements are reasonably pertinent to obtaining medical diagnosis or treatment, even if primary purpose of declarant's statements was not to obtain medical diagnosis and treatment; whether there was sufficient evidence in record to demonstrate that victim's statements were reasonably pertinent to obtaining medical diagnosis and treatment; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court improperly allowed clinical child interview specialist to render expert opinion that appeared to be based on facts of case.</i>	
State v. Harper, 184 CA 24	26A
<i>Conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; attempt to commit robbery in first degree as accessory; whether evidence adduced at trial was sufficient to sustain conviction; claim that conviction of attempt to commit robbery in first degree as accessory required proof that defendant knew or believed that one of cohorts would be armed with deadly weapon during attempted robbery; whether statute (§ 53a-134 [a] [2]) governing robbery in first degree requires proof that defendant intended to possess or intended for accomplice to possess deadly weapon; whether trial court improperly declined to provide jury with unanimity instruction as requested by defendant; claim that jurors must be instructed that unanimity is required on nature or source of reasonable doubt.</i>	
State v. McKethan, 184 CA 187	189A
<i>Murder; carrying pistol without permit; possession of narcotics; motion for joinder; whether trial court abused discretion in consolidating two informations for trial; whether defendant demonstrated that joinder resulted in substantial prejudice; whether trial court's explicit instructions to jury to consider each charge separately in reaching verdict cured risk of substantial prejudice to defendant.</i>	
Taylor v. Wallace, 184 CA 43.	45A
<i>Legal malpractice; ripeness; subject matter jurisdiction; whether plaintiff's claim that defendant attorney provided deficient representation with respect to plaintiff's prior habeas corpus action was ripe for adjudication where plaintiff remained validly incarcerated and conviction has never been invalidated; whether plaintiff had standing to pursue claim that plaintiff was injured as result of defendant's purported fraud on state; claim that trial court abused discretion in denying motion to reargue.</i>	
Volume 184 Cumulative Table of Cases	203A

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Energy and Environmental Protection, Department of	1B
Insurance Department, State of Connecticut.	1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Noitce of Interim Suspension of Attorney	1C
Notice of Interim Suspension and Appointment of Trustee	1C, 3C
Notice of Disbarment of Attorney.	2C
Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel	2C

ASSIGNMENT OF JUDGES

September 3, 2018 through September 1, 2019	1D
---	----